

### **SUMMARY OF PHONE INTERVIEW**

The applicant thanks examiner Moran for the telephone interview taking place on December 29, 2006 and continued on January 3, 2007. These discussions revolved around claim wording changes that might overcome the claim objections stated in the office's most recent response mailed on December 15, 2006.

The applicant agreed to cancel newly submitted claims 30-36.

The applicant agreed to correct the terminology concerning multiply dependent claims.

The applicant agreed that the examiner's suggested wording for claim 1 (given on page 5 of the last office action) is satisfactory and further makes the process clear.

Regarding the wording problem in claims 9 and 10 as described on page 6 of the last office action, the examiner instructed the applicant that since claim 6 is already dependent upon claim 1, it is unnecessary to re-state dependence upon claim 1 (as in the current wording for claims 9 and 10). The applicant agreed to remove the wording showing dependence on claim 1, thus resolving the objection.

After a long discussion regarding the current wording in claim 5, as well as other wording possibilities; and noting that the methodology in that claim describes an alternate way of computing a first resonant frequency; it was agreed that claim 5 could be cancelled without losing coverage of the method described in this patent application. The applicant proposed the cancellation, due to language complexities in the proposed claim that might create confusion for the reader, and possibly leading to an office rejection on that matter. Also, in view of the long prosecution period of the application, the applicant indicated a wish to resolve the issues regarding claim 5 in a straightforward manner.

### **REMARKS**

The applicant makes reference to the phone interview summary on the previous page, regarding resolution of currently outstanding rejection issues on this application.

The applicant also briefly calls attention to her newly-added addition of the word "or" at the end of the first indented clause of claim 6. This was added in order to clarify that the first dividing step, was not intended to be followed by a multiplying step as stated in the second indented clause. The applicant wishes to submit this clarification at this time in order to avoid a lack of clarity rejection regarding this claim. If the addition of the word "or" at that location is problematic, the applicant will correct in whatever way is necessary.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant states that a full and complete response has been made herein to the Office Action mailed December 15, 2006, and asks that all amended claims submitted in this application be placed in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully requests early consideration of the present application, entry of the amendments to claims, and withdrawal of all rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

*Charlene A. Boehm*

Charlene A. Boehm

January 8, 2007

Charlene Boehm  
320 Gilbert Rd.  
Columbus, NC 28722  
(828) 863-4317